# T

1. Interp: The affirmative must not defend that “Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech to free speech zones.”
2. Viol: they read that plan text
3. 1. Semantics- speech zones are not constitutionally protected speech

a. Mitchell ev says post 9-11 speech zones were made constitutional by the Supreme Court

b. First amendment protections don’t apply to time, place or manner.

Legal Dictionary ["Time, Place, and Manner Restrictions"] AZ

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees Freedom of Speech. This guarantee generally safeguards the right of individuals to express themselves without governmental restraint. Nevertheless, the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment is not absolute. It has never been interpreted to guarantee all forms of speech without any restraint whatsoever. Instead, the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that state and federal governments may place reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of individual expression. Time, place, and manner (TPM) restrictions accommodate public convenience and promote order by regulating traffic flow, preserving property interests, conserving the environment, and protecting the administration of justice.

Your plan ignores the constitutionality plank altogether by saying even if a form of speech is not constitutionally protected, then it should be restricted. That clearly does not fall into the subset of what the resolution is asking for- it’s like proving that my shoes are green when asked whether or not my socks are.

Semantics come first

Insert as many args as needed….

2. Ground-.

A. Speech zones stop students from taking political stances, which clearly is a high level of speech that should be protected. That means the aff gets to supercharge their impacts, and get persuasive large impact offense.

B. The aff doesn’t get rid of other restrictions on things like hate speech, which are the basis of most negative disad’s and kritiks. Functionally, protests bad is the only response to this aff, which is a terrible argument because there is no uniqueness brink for the disad AND there are a lot of link turns to it.

Ground is key to fairness since equal access to arguments controls equal access to the ballot.

# Politics DA

A. Trump pushing tax reforms now, but it won’t pass. Congressional Republicans are too divided and Trump can’t unite them

Irwin 4-11, Neil, Can Trump and Congress Solve the Rubik’s Cube of Tax Reform?, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/11/upshot/can-trump-and-congress-solve-the-rubiks-cube-of-tax-reform.html?\_r=0

As Congress and the Trump administration turn their sights on overhauling the tax code, it’s a good time to think about the great three-dimensional brain twister of the 1980s, the [Rubik’s Cube](https://www.rubiks.com/store/cubes). That’s partly because the first and last time there was a comprehensive rewrite of the tax code, it was 1986. But there is more than that. What makes trying to solve a Rubik’s Cube so exasperating is that every rotation you make to align the colors on one side messes up something on one of the other sides. Nothing moves in isolation; everything affects everything else, and rarely for the better. The 1986 tax overhaul took two years. Despite bipartisan backing from the Reagan administration and congressional Democrats, it had many false starts and reversals in its voyage to becoming a law. [Continue reading the main story](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/11/upshot/can-trump-and-congress-solve-the-rubiks-cube-of-tax-reform.html?_r=0#story-continues-2) “There are thousands of moving pieces in full-blown tax reform,” said Jeffrey Birnbaum, an author of a book about the passage of that legislation, “[Showdown at Gucci Gulch](http://www.nytimes.com/1987/07/05/books/and-they-said-it-couldn-t-be-done.html?pagewanted=all),” and now a public affairs strategist at [BGR Group](http://www.bgrdc.com/). “Every entity and interest you can think of has a stake, and there are inevitably winners and losers. And if you’re a loser, you know it.” Add in a [more polarized](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/03/business/economy/trump-election-democracy.html) political environment, an administration that has been [light on policy expertise](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/01/upshot/donald-trump-is-betting-that-policy-expertise-doesnt-matter.html), and a Republican congressional contingent that hasn’t shown [much ability](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/28/upshot/why-the-trump-agenda-is-moving-slowly-the-republicans-wonk-gap.html) to pass complex legislation in more than a decade, and the puzzle looks all the more complicated. Congress and the Trump administration will solve tax reform only by navigating difficult trade-offs. Think of these trade-offs as the six sides of a Rubik’s cube, each of which needs to match up perfectly — but each of which can foul up the others. Bipartisan support vs. conservative goals. The Republican majority in the Senate is narrow: It takes only three Republican senators (out of 52) to vote against a measure to ensure its failure, should Democrats stay united in opposition. The [G.O.P.](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org) majority in the House is not as narrow, but it might as well be because of ideological divisions. That means Republican tax writers need a bill to keep party members on board, or one that could attract significant Democratic support and allow more room for Republican defections. In theory at least, there’s room for common ground with Democrats on the corporate income tax. President Obama proposed corporate tax changes that would have lowered the rate on businesses to 28 percent from its current 35 percent while changing its structure. But to gain any hope of [meaningful Democratic support](https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-to-make-tax-reform-bipartisan-1491164051), some key conservative goals would almost certainly need to be cast aside. Say goodbye to [lowering the top rate](https://www.wsj.com/articles/democrats-conditions-for-tax-overhaul-make-bipartisan-deal-unlikely-1491735604) on individuals’ income or other changes that primarily benefit the wealthy, or to anything that decreases the amount of revenue the government will collect in the years ahead. Even if those concessions are made, Democrats will be resistant to giving President Trump a big policy win — meaning it may take more concessions than it would in a less polarized political moment to get even a few Democrats to the table. Republicans, who showed their internal divisions during the health bill debate, need to stay united or to give up on some of the longstanding priorities of the conservative movement (and of Republican donors).

B. Trump campaigned against political correctness and retaliated against the Berkeley protests, which means even if universities are the actor, he perceptually gets credit for the implementation of the aff. It proves he can beat even the most liberal institutions.

Brown & Mangan 17 [Sarah Brown and Katherine Mangan, “Trump Can’t Cut Off Berkeley’s Funds by Himself. His Threat Still Raised Alarm,” The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 3, 2017, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Trump-Can-t-Cut-Off/239100?cid=trend_right>.] JW

Back in October, when President Trump vowed to "end" political correctness on college campuses, it was unclear how the then-presidential candidate planned to go about doing that. On Thursday, he dropped a hint: He threatened to cut off federal funding to the University of California at Berkeley after violent protests there prompted campus leaders to call off a talk by a far-right provocateur. Milo Yiannopoulos is a Breitbart News editor and Trump supporter who has for months traveled to campuses to give talks that often draw protests and have sometimes resulted in violence. He was once permanently banned from Twitter for his role in a harassment campaign against the actress Leslie Jones, and he has drawn heavy fire for his insulting comments about feminists, Black Lives Matters protesters, Islam, and topics he considers part of leftist ideology. Mr. Yiannopoulos was scheduled to speak on Berkeley’s campus late Wednesday, as part of his "Dangerous Faggot" tour, and more than 1,500 students gathered outside the venue to peacefully protest. Then about 100 additional protesters — mostly nonstudents, Berkeley officials said — joined the fray and hurled smoke bombs, broke windows, and started fires. The violence forced the campus police to put Berkeley on lockdown and led university leaders to cancel the event. The following morning, a political commentator suggested on Fox & Friends First that President Trump should take away Berkeley’s federal funding. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Trump decided to weigh in. Not surprisingly, Mr. Yiannopoulos liked that idea. On Facebook Thursday, he linked to a Breitbart article about the federal money Berkeley receives, adding, "Cut the whole lot, Donald J. Trump." Others were quick to condemn the president’s threat. U.S. Rep. Barbara Lee, a California Democrat whose district includes the Berkeley campus, tweeted back: "President Trump doesn’t have a license to blackmail universities. He’s the president, not a dictator, and his empty threats are an abuse of power." Later, in a statement, Ms. Lee said Mr. Yiannopoulos "has made a career of inflaming racist, sexist and nativist sentiments." Meanwhile, she wrote, "Berkeley has a proud history of dissent and students were fully within their rights to protest peacefully." Could Mr. Trump take away a university’s federal funding for what he sees as a violation of the First Amendment? Not on his own, and not entirely, some scholars say, though there are ways he could advocate for cutting some of it. Regardless, Mr. Trump’s singling out of Berkeley is worth paying attention to, they say, because it serves as a message to other campus officials that they may soon be put in the position of responding to the president’s social-media whims. How Berkeley Prepared Berkeley’s chancellor, Nicholas B. Dirks, went to great lengths last week to explain why the university would not give in to demands to cancel Mr. Yiannopoulos’s appearance. The First Amendment, the chancellor wrote, does not allow the university to censor or prohibit such events. "In our view, Mr. Yiannopoulos is a troll and provocateur who uses odious behavior in part to ‘entertain,’ but also to deflect any serious engagement with ideas," Mr. Dirks wrote. But, he added, "we are defending the right to free expression at an historic moment for our nation, when this right is once again of paramount importance." Mr. Dirks went on to warn that the university "will not stand idly by" if anyone tries to violate university policies by disrupting the talk. Still, the furor over the protests delighted many activists who have been arguing for years that pressure to be politically correct on campuses has stifled those with conservative views. Among them were members of the "alt-right" movement, a loosely affiliated group characterized by its white nationalist, sexist, and anti-Semitic views. The group clearly felt vindicated by the president’s assertion that Berkeley doesn’t allow free speech, which came on the heels of the online discussion group Reddit banning an alt-right community for publishing personally identifiable information about people it is criticizing. The Left is trying to shut us down because they are losing. We’re the real opposition on the Right. We’re... https://t.co/Q9HayfRhSD — AltRight.com (@AltRight\_com) February 2, 2017 On Thursday, Mr. Dirks released a statement doubling down on his earlier comments about the campus’s commitment to free speech. The violence, he said, was perpetrated by "more than 100 armed individuals clad all in black who utilized paramilitary tactics to engage in violent, destructive behavior" designed to shut the event down. "We deeply regret that the violence unleashed by this group undermined the First Amendment rights of the speaker as well as those who came to lawfully assemble and protest his presence." The university had anticipated a large crowd of protesters at Mr. Yiannopoulos’s talk on Wednesday night and had brought in dozens of police officers from across the university system to help maintain order. But "we could not plan for the unprecedented," Mr. Dirks wrote. The event was called off only after the campus police concluded that the speaker had to be evacuated for his own safety, he added. “We could not plan for the unprecedented.” Mr. Trump’s threat was also criticized by a group that is known for condemning campuses that it sees as violating free speech rights. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, known as FIRE, released a statement Thursday objecting to "both violence and attempts to silence protected expression." The group said, however, that it had seen no evidence that Berkeley, as an institution, had made any effort to silence Mr. Yiannopoulos, and that the university had, in fact, resisted calls to cancel his visit until the situation got out of hand. FIRE added a caution that seemed to be directed at President Trump’s threat to strip funding from Berkeley. "To punish an educational institution for the criminal behavior of those not under its control and in contravention of its policies, whether through the loss of federal funds or through any other means, would be deeply inappropriate and most likely unlawful," its statement said. Withholding Federal Funds The idea of punishing colleges for free-speech controversies was originally Ben Carson’s idea, said Jonathan Zimmerman, a professor of the history of education at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Carson, a neurosurgeon and former Republican presidential candidate, said in October 2015 that he would have the U.S. Department of Education "monitor our institutions of higher education for extreme political bias and deny federal funding if it exists." Terry W. Hartle, a senior vice president at the American Council on Education, took the question mark on the end of Mr. Trump’s tweet literally. The president might have been asking, Could I withhold federal funds from Berkeley? Mr. Hartle said. Yes, the federal government has the authority to withhold federal funds like financial aid from colleges that engage in certain activities, Mr. Hartle said. And it has the authority to attach conditions to the money it gives out. The Solomon Amendment, for instance, requires colleges to admit ROTC or military recruiters to their campus or risk losing money. But Congress would have to act to give the government the ability to take away federal funds for controversies involving the First Amendment, Mr. Hartle said. The government also couldn’t pull funding from Berkeley by retroactively saying the institution’s federal money is contingent on protecting free speech, said Alexander (Sasha) Volokh, an associate professor of law at Emory University. "If the funding comes explicitly with strings attached, which is that you must adequately protect free speech on your campus if you want these funds, and if the university takes these funds knowing the condition, that’s one thing," he said. The U.S. Supreme Court has weighed in several times on strings attached to federal funding, Mr. Volokh said, and has determined that such conditions must be clearly stated in advance and related to the matter being funded. For instance, he said, the court said it was OK for the government to tie federal highway funds to a requirement for states to adopt a drinking age of 21, because highway safety could be affected by the drinking age. But the National Institutes of Health probably couldn’t attach a requirement for free-speech protection to a grant for researching Ebola, he said. Moving forward, Mr. Trump could tell federal research agencies that some of their contracts with colleges and researchers should now include stipulations about free speech, Mr. Volokh said. "I have the feeling that Trump had something much blunter in mind," he said. ‘Uncharted Territory’ Mr. Trump’s social-media attack on Berkeley raises another question for colleges: how to respond to such tweets. "This is uncharted territory for all organizations," not just colleges, Mr. Hartle said, citing Mr. Trump’s criticism of Boeing for what he considered to be an overpriced contract for constructing two Air Force One planes that future presidents will use. (Boeing subsequently promised to keep the cost below $4 billion.) “You can't just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you.” It might not be wise to pick a fight with someone who has millions of Twitter followers, Mr. Hartle said, but "you can’t just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you." Berkeley is in a particularly difficult situation, Mr. Hartle said, because in his view the university did everything right when Mr. Yiannopoulos came to the campus. "Berkeley tried to allow him to speak and to allow protesters to protest," he said. "Everything was fine until the protests turned violent." One challenge for colleges, he said, will probably involve dealing with people, particularly nonstudents, who want to disrupt speakers and who "now see resorting to violence as simply another tactic in an effort to accomplish their purpose." If Mr. Trump were to push Congress to pass a law giving him the authority to take away federal funds from colleges for free-speech controversies, Mr. Hartle said, "they should carve out some sort of exception when it involved violence or a police request." “Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech.” While the president might not make such legislation a priority, college officials shouldn’t dismiss his criticism of Berkeley, said Mr. Zimmerman, of Penn. "It’s ridiculous and frightening for the president to be threatening to withhold money based on his perception of what’s happening with free speech on campus," he said. On the other hand, he said, "Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech." When institutions disinvite speakers or try to quash a right-wing group’s event or demonstration, Mr. Zimmerman said, "they’re playing right into Trump’s hands." Given the violence, Mr. Zimmerman doesn’t begrudge Berkeley’s administration for canceling the speech. But he described as problematic a letter signed by dozens of professors saying that Mr. Yiannopoulos shouldn’t be allowed to speak on campus. Ultimately, Mr. Volokh is more concerned about the way in which Mr. Trump made his point, versus the content of the tweet. "It wasn’t enough for him to say that free speech is important," Mr. Volokh said. "He had to do it in a way that was threatening."

C. 2 independent internal links.

1. Winners win: Presidential boldness creates a steamroll effect.

Green 10 [David Michael Green, professor of political science at Hofstra University, “The Do-Nothing 44th President,” OpEd News, June 11, 2010, http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html] JW

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

2. Aff gives Trump polcap- the plan wins over the Ways and Means committee—they see it as bipartisan and it’s a top priority

**Jagoda 16** [NAOMI JAGODA , 3-2-2016, "House Republican concerned about colleges stifling students' speech,”]

The chairman of the House Ways and Means oversight subcommittee expressed concern Wednesday that colleges are stifling students’ political speech because they are incorrectly worried that such speech could jeopardize the schools’ tax-exempt statuses. Through provisions in the tax code, “taxpayers give financial benefits to schools based on the educational value that they offer to our society,” Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.) said at a hearing. “When colleges and universities suppress speech, however, we have to question whether that educational mission is really being fulfilled.” Roskam asked students, faculty and administrators who have had their speech suppressed to share their experiences with the committee by emailing campus.speech@mail.house.gov. Frances Hill, a professor at the University of Miami School of Law, said during the hearing that “students can do almost anything” without jeopardizing a college’s tax-exempt status. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is more likely to be concerned about university administrators engaging in political speech without making clear that they are not speaking on behalf of the school, she added. Catherine Sevcenko, director of litigation at the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, said that students are likely being censored because colleges are confused about IRS guidelines. “As long as the IRS guidance is ambiguous, censorship will win out every time,” she said, adding that lawmakers need to communicate to the IRS that there is an “urgent need for guidance.” Sevcenko also said the issue of censorship is a “bipartisan problem,” and students are being stifled for both liberal and conservative speech. Roskam told reporters after the hearing that he’s interested in looking to see if there’s something the IRS can do to make it clear that student expression won’t jeopardize colleges’ tax exemptions. “It seems like the letter of the law is clear, but for whatever reason, it’s not penetrating,” he said. Democrats on the panel argued the free speech issue does not fall under the committee's jurisdiction. They suggested that it would be a better use of the panel’s time to hold hearings about the effect of budget cuts on the IRS’s customer service and about identity thieves stealing taxpayer information. “Let me be clear. We have plenty of work do, and this is not it,” said Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.), the subcommittee’s ranking member. Rep. Joseph Crowley (D-N.Y.) said the subcommittee is “searching for a problem where no problem exists.” But Roskam and other Republicans defended a hearing about colleges limiting students’ free expression. “To say that we don’t have a role here is disingenuous,” said Rep. Tom Reed (R-N.Y.).

D. Trump’s tax reform will doom millions of middle and working class Americans to extreme poverty – historical precedent proves.

Matthews 16 Donald Trump’s presidency is going to be a disaster for the white working class, Updated by [Dylan Matthews](http://www.vox.com/authors/dylan) Nov 9, 2016, http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/9/13572172/donald-trump-white-working-class

Lower-income whites are not going to suffer from Trump’s restrictions on Muslims traveling, or from his mass deportations, or from his cavalier attitude toward police brutality. But Trump has promised an economic agenda that will increase the ranks of the uninsured by tens of millions, that will eliminate crucial safety net programs for low- and moderate-income Americans, that could start a trade war that drives up prices and devastates the economy, and that will put in place a tax code that exacerbates inequality and leaves many families with children worse off. That affects all Americans — and with Republicans retaining control over the House and Senate, it stands a very good chance of passing. For the past decade, Paul Ryan has languished either in the House minority or under a Democratic president, putting together extreme proposals for completely overhauling the safety net. [Medicare would be voucherized](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2013/03/12/paul-ryans-budget-isnt-about-the-deficit/) — either with or without the option for beneficiaries to keep the traditional program. He offered [one of the most extreme Social Security privatization proposals](http://www.cbpp.org/research/the-ryan-sununu-social-security-plan) of the 2005-’06 debate on the issue. But the worst is saved for means-tested programs, in particular Medicaid and food stamps. He would move fast to [“block-grant” food stamps and Medicaid](http://www.cbpp.org/blog/ryan-and-block-granting-the-safety-net), transforming them from guarantees of food and medical care for the nation’s poorest people into a slush fund for states. This [approach was devastating during welfare reform](http://www.vox.com/2016/6/20/11789988/clintons-welfare-reform), and it’s impossible to imagine a way this would happen that wouldn’t exacerbate extreme poverty and hunger. After the end of welfare, food stamps were the last cash-like benefit upon which people without earnings could rely. Ryan will put an end to that. And then [he’d cut all these programs for good measure](http://www.cbpp.org/research/ryan-plan-gets-69-percent-of-its-budget-cuts-from-programs-for-people-with-low-or-moderate). Sixty-nine percent of the cuts in his last budget came from programs for people with low or moderate incomes, including $137 billion over 10 years from food stamps (now the block grant), up to $125 billion from Pell Grants, and another $150 billion or more from other low-income programs like Supplemental Security Income and the earned income tax credit. [Medicaid would be cut by more than a quarter](http://www.cbpp.org/research/ryan-block-grant-proposal-would-cut-medicaid-by-more-than-one-quarter-by-2024-and-more) through the block grant. Ryan has sometimes trolled journalists by claiming to support boosting the EITC, only to propose paying for it by [cutting other programs for the poor](http://www.vox.com/2014/12/2/7320363/eitc-child-credit-ryan). These are changes that will dramatically decrease insurance coverage among the poor, increase hunger, and greatly exacerbate poverty in its most extreme form. And while Trump has expressed wariness of tampering with Medicare or Social Security, he has expressed no such hesitation about Ryan’s proposed cuts to programs for the poor. The Ryan budget has become the key economic agenda of the Republican Party over the past six years. By now it wields substantial, likely majority, support in both houses of Congress, even if Ryan himself does not survive as speaker. And it’s hard to imagine Trump using a veto to prevent these kinds of reforms and cuts from becoming law. As a result, Trump will likely oversee the most vicious cuts to programs for poor and medium-income people of any president since Reagan — and could very well go further than Reagan did. The result will almost certainly be a massive increase in uninsurance for the lower-income working people currently covered by Medicaid, an increase in poverty and hunger for the working poor on food stamps, and a large increase in extreme poverty.

Weighing arguments

1. extreme poverty outweighs the case – not being able to have access to food at night, basic supplies, and human decency is a prerequisite to having effective speech
2. cutting programs for the poor can have a spillover effect into cutting FASFA which is what many minorities relies on in order to even get federal aid for colleges – link turns their solvency because it means minorities don’t get to college and get to interact with counterspeech

# CP

Counterplan: Public colleges and universities ought to extend free speech zones to the entire campus.

Vespa 16, Matt, 2016, Freedom: Florida School Wants To Make Entire Campus A Free Speech Zone

<http://townhall.com/tipsheet/mattvespa/2016/04/21/freedom-florida-school-wants-to-make-entire-campus-a-free-speech-zone-n2151890>

As we continue to hear about the legions of precious cupcakes fighting to keep differing opinions, especially those that veer off the progressive path, from being tolerated on campus, on Florida school is pushing back. They’re fighting the snowflake hordes of Mordor. Florida Atlantic University has a free speech zone, but the local student governing body recently passed a resolution to make the current free speech zone encompass the entire campus. No safe spaces, but you, your ideas, and whether you have the maturity to defend them. I’m sure these cupcakes will be afraid that some of their peers are Trump supporters. Yes, you are free to pick the presidential candidate of your choice without fear of retribution. Some might be pro-life—yes, a sizable portion of the country, about half, view abortion as infanticide (they’re not wrong). Some people might have differing opinions on marriage. And a few students might–dare I say–support Second Amendment rights. Deal with it

B. Mutually Exclusive- the aff eliminates speech zones while the CP expands them

C. Net benefits

1. CP solves the entirety of the case- the aff advantage is that zones are used as an excuse to silence protests elsewhere. That isn’t possible under the CP, we eliminate the geography problem by expanding it to everywhere.
2. Any solvency deficit or turn on case are solved by the CP by expanding zones where you can say anything, anywhere.
3. Avoids the link to politics- looks less like colleges are completely reversing their position on free speech because they are keeping the same policies, just expanding them.

# Case

1. Size of link is tiny
2. 1/6 have speech zones

b. Aff is too small to have solvency- there are thousands of other restrictions on protests- like a forward note and generic speech code restrictions. This means even after eliminating the speech zone excuse, all these other restrictions prevent protests.

1. There is massive alt solvency for aff impacts—for example discussion off-campus by college students in the town square should resolve aff impacts if they are true. Every other discussion that happens post college by adults can solve as well. Their impacts are empirically denied

3. Turn- Free speech zones stop agents of the state from ending protest.

ACLU Know Your Rights: Free Speech, Protests & Demonstrations ACLU no date [https://www.aclunc.org/our-work/know-your-rights/free-speech-protests-demonstrations](https://www.aclunc.org/our-work/know-your-rights/free-speech-protests-demonstrations" \t "_blank)

**The police are charged with safeguarding the public during a demonstration, but they can't use their powers to stop you from exercising your free-speech** rights. As long as you're observing reasonable time, place and manner restrictions, the **police may not break up a gathering** unless there is a "clear and present danger of riot, disorder, interference with traffic upon the public streets, or other immediate threat to public safety . . . ." **And police officers may not use their powers in a way that has a "chilling effect"** on ordinary people who wish to express their views.

Outweighs on scale- most severe way to end and protest and it spillsover, their world still always protests, it is just in a different place so link is small.

4. Alt causes to neolib- neoconservatives, economic selfishness, etc.

5. No solvency- students are already hella liberal, other will ignore and the aff doenst do anything to net change that.

#### 4. Protests are a ruse – they are a reactive form of politics that focuses purely on affect and cedes institutional politics.

**Srniceke 15** [Srnicek, PHD, and Williams, PhD Candidate , 15 (Nick, PhD IR @LSE, Alex, Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a world without work)

From the alter-globalisation struggles of the late 1990s, through the antiwar and ecological coalitions of the early 2000s, and into the new student uprisings and Occupy movements since 2008, a common pattern emerges: resistance struggles rise rapidly, mobilise increasingly large numbers of people, and yet fade away only to be replaced by a renewed sense of apathy, melancholy and defeat. Despite the desires of millions for a better world, the effects of these movements prove minimal. A FUNNY THING HAPPENED ON THE WAY TO THE PROTEST Failure permeates this cycle of struggles, and as a result, many of the tactics on the contemporary left have taken on a ritualistic nature, laden with a heavy dose of fatalism. The dominant tactics - protesting, marching, occupying, and various other forms of direct action - have become part of a well established narrative, with the people and the police each playing their assigned roles. The limits of these actions are particularly visible in those brief moments when the script changes. As one activist puts it, of a protest at the 2001 Summit of the Americas: On April 20, the first day of the demonstrations, we marched in our thousands towards the fence, behind which 34 heads of state had gathered to hammer out a hemispheric trade deal. Under a hail of catapult-launched teddy bears, activists dressed in black quickly removed the fence’s supports with bolt cutters and pulled it down with grapples as onlookers cheered them on. For a brief moment, nothing stood between us and the convention centre. We scrambled atop the toppled fence, but for the most part we went no further, as if our intention all along had been simply to replace the state's chain-link and concrete barrier with a human one of our own making.1 We see here the symbolic and ritualistic nature of the actions, combined with the thrill of having done something - but with a deep uncertainty that appears at the first break with the expected narrative. The role of dutiful protestor had given these activists no indication of what to do when the barriers fell. Spectacular political confrontations like the Stop the War marches, the now-familiar melees against the G20 or World Trade Organization and the rousing scenes of democracy in Occupy Wall Street all give the appearance of being highly significant, as if something were genuinely at stake.2 Yet nothing changed, and long-term victories were traded for a simple registration of discontent. To outside observers, it is often not even clear what the movements want, beyond expressing a generalised discontent with the world. The contemporary protest has become a melange of wild and varied demands. The 2009 G20 summit in London, for instance, featured protestors marching for issues that spanned from grandiose anti-capitalist stipulations to modest goals centred on more local issues. When demands can be discerned at all, they usually fail to articulate anything substantial. They are often nothing more than empty slogans - as meaningful as calling for world peace. In more recent struggles, the very idea of making demands has been questioned. The Occupy movement infamously struggled to articulate meaningful goals, worried that anything too substantial would be divisive.5 And a broad range of student occupations across the Western world has taken up the mantra of ‘no demands’ under the misguided belief that demanding nothing is a radical act.4 When asked what the ultimate upshot of these actions has been, participants differ between admitting to a general sense of futility and pointing to the radicalisation of those who took part. If we look at protests today as an exercise in public awareness, they appear to have had mixed success at best. Their messages are mangled by an unsympathetic media smitten by images of property destruction - assuming that the media even acknowledges a form of contention that has become increasingly repetitive and boring. Some argue that, rather than trying to achieve a certain end, these movements, protests and occupations in fact exist only for their own sake.5 The aim in this case is to achieve a certain transformation of the participants, and create a space outside of the usual operations of power. While there is a degree of truth to this, things like protest camps tend to remain ephemeral, small-scale and ultimately unable to challenge the larger structures of the neoliberal economic system. This is politics transmuted into pastime - politics-as-drug experience, perhaps - rather than anything capable of transforming society. Such protests are registered only in the minds of their participants, bypassing any transformation of social structures. While these efforts at radicalisation and awareness-raising are undoubtedly important to some degree, there still remains the question of exactly when these sequences might pay off. Is there a point at which a critical mass of consciousness-raising will be ready for action? Protests can build connections, encourage hope and remind people of their power. Yet, beyond these transient feelings, politics still demands the exercise of that power, lest these affective bonds go to waste. If we will not act after one of the largest crises of capitalism, then when? The emphasis on the affective aspects of protests plays into a broader trend that has come to privilege the affective as the site of real politics.

#### 5. Without speech zones, protests become violent, threatening public safety and undermining non-violence.

Tate 17 Tate, Emily. [Journalist, The Huffington Post] “Bracing for Black Bloc.” InsideHigherEd.com, February 13, 2017.

A crowd of about 1,500 people -- many of whom were college students -- gathered on the University of California’s Berkeley campus this month to peacefully protest the appearance of conservative writer and provocateur Milo Yiannopoulos. They had come to march, to carry signs and to raise their voices in dissent of the Breitbart figure’s controversial points of view, as is within their First Amendment rights. They did not come to start fires or break windows. But their message was overshadowed by another, smaller mass of about 150 protesters who did come to start fires, break windows and hurl rocks at police officers -- and who accomplished all of those things. They wore black and concealed their faces with masks. They brought -- and used -- bats, metal rods, fireworks and Molotov cocktails to get their message across, in the process undermining “the First Amendment rights of the speaker as well as those who came to lawfully assemble and protest his presence,” a spokesperson for Berkeley said in a statement. The group, which many have characterized as one made up of anarchists, was practicing black bloc tactics. Black bloc is a strategy intended to unify protesters through their black clothing, masks and paramilitary tactics. The protesters become indistinguishable from one another, creating confusion for law enforcement officials and chaos among innocent bystanders. Black bloc is more of a shifting movement and shared strategy than a formal organization. It can be traced back to the 1970s in Germany, The Washington Post reported. The tactics have been used at protests across the globe, but in the last few months -- particularly since Nov. 8, when Donald Trump won the U.S. presidential election -- black bloc protesters have made more appearances than usual. They interrupted peaceful anti-Trump protests in Portland, Ore., the week of the election. They descended on Washington for President Trump’s inauguration last month, smashing the windows of a Starbucks and damaging a bank and a limousine, among other property. Later that same night, across the country, they caused mayhem on the University of Washington campus. The Berkeley incident has demonstrated to many campus officials the danger posed by black bloc protests to colleges. Nonviolent student protests can get mischaracterized. So, too, can the actions of a university, as when critics (including President Trump) suggest that institutions aren't committed to free speech that black bloc protests prevent. Damage can be significant -- at Berkeley, the black bloc protesters destroyed about $100,000 worth of campus property. Officials at Berkeley are still investigating the events that unfolded there Feb. 1. Meanwhile, security officers at other campuses have begun to discuss preparedness and best practices around these issues. David Mitchell, chief of police at the University of Maryland College Park, called the recent resurgence of black bloc an “infiltration.” “These are folks, in my view, who are not interested in freedom of speech. They’re interested in taking advantage of an opportunity to commit crimes and wreak havoc,” said Mitchell, who has been in law enforcement for over 40 years and has witnessed black bloc tactics on several occasions. **“They are** here to destroy property and … cause disorder. **I**t’s very unfortunate, and it’s very unlawful.” The University of Maryland has almost 40,000 students, and over the years, Mitchell said, he’s seen those students protest just about every issue out there. “I can differentiate between black bloc and my student body,” Mitchell said. “My student body is interested in freedom of speech and the freedom to assemble.” “I know many of our protesters here on campus -- these are good people who want to air their concerns and want their voices to be heard,” he added. “When you have that and it’s a peaceful protest, then suddenly there’s an infiltration with fires starting, it reinforces the bias against college kids and college students protesting. Certainly we don’t want that here. I don’t think my students want that here**.”** It’s true that, amid the chaos that erupted on Berkeley’s campus, many people associated the violence with Berkeley students.However, the university believes the anarchists “invaded” the campus and were not affiliated with its students. “At Berkeley, it’s clear there was a very serious difference between the majority of protesters and the minority who were engaged in black bloc tactics,” said Angus Johnston, a historian of American student activism and online blogger for the website Student Activism. “The vast majority of students protesting were not engaged in those tactics.” Despite crowd control and safety measures in place to handle those who were peacefully protesting Yiannopoulos’s appearance, Berkeley officials did not anticipate black bloc. The protests there, which also left five people with minor injuries, have reignited a conversation at other colleges about what to do if a similar incident occurred on their campuses. Other colleges and universities should look at what happened at Berkeley and learn from it -- including what worked and what could have been improved, said Sue Riseling, executive director of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. When something like this happens, campus law enforcement officials have to consider dozens of variables, she said, including where the protest is happening, how quickly it could escalate, whether the violent and nonviolent protesters are intermixed or separated, how many security and police officers are available to help, and crowd size, she said. “What we have found is being prepared ahead of time is really key,” Riseling said. “It may not be a speaker that trips it. It may be another action of the president that trips it. It may be a community member. You don’t know what’s going to trip it.” The violent protests seen at Berkeley and on Inauguration Day interfere with all Americans’ right to participate in democracy, Riseling said. “Their voices are silenced by this black bloc activity,” she said. “It’s very important that people who are invited to speak get to speak … no matter how repugnant some people may feel their views are. They are protected under the Constitution, and that’s really important. It’s also important for people who disagree with the speaker to have their voices heard.” Both Riseling and Mitchell commended Berkeley’s handling of the situation because it did not result in severe injuries or death. “It always could be worse,” Mitchell said. “The property damage was disappointing and absolutely unlawful, but that certainly could’ve been worse as well. I applaud the way they handled the incident.” Kim Richmond, director of the National Center for Campus Public Safety, said she has been trying to remind universities about the resources available to plan and prepare for these events. “Each community should be having conversations ahead of time with administration, students, potential activists,” Richmond said. “I think the campuses who are doing a good job of preparation are looking at every time there’s a situation, or even if there’s not, simulating a situation and asking, ‘What is our local response going to look like? What is our campus’s stance on this?’” Colleges have to be prepared to adapt, Richmond said. For example, at Berkeley, the police officers felt that trying to get in the middle of the crowd would’ve sparked more violence and resulted in more severe injuries. They chose not to try to arrest the black bloc protesters, because they felt it would have compromised the safety of their students. These are scenarios that no college wants to find itself in, but Mitchell said it’s important to have a plan in place[.] because, given the current political climate, it’s likely to keep happening. “The mood of the country is such today, with such division, that I don’t think this is going away any time soon,” Mitchell said.

#### 6. Speech zones on public college campuses WORK to keep productive dialogue.

Connor 16 Connor, Alex [Journalist, Iowa State Daily], Makayla Tendall, and IowaWatch.org. “Iowa State University Wrestles With Free-Speech Zones.” Iowa Center for Public Affairs Journalism, May 2016.

Austin Thielmann, a junior from Manson, Iowa, studying political science at Iowa State, said he was torn when it came to deciding on whether or not speech should be limited on a college campus, but ultimately decided that free speech zones work. Students know they can hear about issues there and those who would be uncomfortable with discussions there can avoid the areas, he said. “In all actuality at Iowa State University, we allow freedom of speech anywhere,” Thielmann said. Rectanus, who has taught at Iowa State since the 1980s, said controversial events on campus over the years have been important for education. “A conversation can occur in different contexts,” Rectanus said. “It could be in the open, it could be in the library or in the context of a panel discussion that sponsored by a group.”He adds: Tom Short, an antagonistic traveling campus evangelist, has preached in the free speech zone outside Parks Library twice annually in recent years. He says his goal is to win back sinners’ souls before a strict, biblical God smites the gays, lesbians, non-believers, sluts and many more to an eternal hell. His sermons have provoked atheist and agnostic groups, LGBT support groups and students like one Short called a whore, to speak out about slut shaming or to share their views on Christianity, religion and other social issues. Many students and student groups often stop to debate with the preacher. Protesters greeted conservative political commentator Katie Pavlich when she came to Iowa State’s campus in March 2015 to support allowing concealed weapons on campus as a possible safeguard for women against an attempted sexual assault. College Republicans and Young America’s Foundation, an organization promoting conservative ideals, sponsored Pavlich’s lecture. Nigel Hanson, former president of the College Republicans, said the lecture was arranged to add another voice to the conversation about preventing sexual assault on college campuses. But some students and faculty members who protested and spoke against Pavlich’s views said they felt the lecture was insensitive and inappropriate. Iowa State administrators sent a staff counselor who sat in on the lecture, ready to speak with students who requested the counselor's time after the event. “It might be agitating, but she wants to work to fix the problem,” Hanson said[,] about Pavlich in an interview with the Iowa State Daily. “I think it opened our eyes to some new perspective.”